S/N: 10/710,626 Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2009

## Remarks

In light of the amendments and remarks presented herein, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 26 and 28 are hereby amended, and claim 14 has been hereby cancelled.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-15, 17-18 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (U.S. App. Pub. 2002/0024537). Applicant submits that Jones does not teach or suggest all elements of at least the independent claims, as amended.

For example, claim 1 recites, inter alia, "wherein one of the two or more computer systems is the marketing offer system, and further comprising the marketing offer system transmitting generating and transmitting advertising materials regarding customer vehicle personalization and vehicle accessories based on the one or more VIN-specific customer vehicle attributes." Claims 26 and 28 contain similar recitations.

According to the Examiner, the closest teaching of this is in paragraphs 44 and 54 of Jones in the alleged teaching that Jones "sends out service reminders." The Examiner interprets this as "an offer to perform a service."

First, Applicant notes that a service reminder is not an offer to perform a service, but rather a reminder that a service needs or will soon need completion. Second, and more importantly, "sending out a service reminder" is neither

S/N: 10/710,626 Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2009

"generating" nor "sending" "advertising materials regarding customer vehicle personalization and vehicle accessories." Thus, Jones does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations.

For at least this reason, claims 1, 26 and 28 should be allowable. Claims 2-7, 9-10, 13, 15, 17-18, 27 and 29 should be allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Claims 8, 11, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones.

As previously noted, Jones does not teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 1 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, Claims 8, 11, 16 and 19 should be allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons presented herein, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

S/N: 10/710,626 Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2009

The Petition fee of \$490 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted, **JOE RETZBACH et al**.

By /Bernard P. Tomsa/

Bernard P Tomsa Reg. No. 60,121 Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: <u>May 21, 2010</u>

## BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351